

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 4-25 are pending in the application, with 4, 5, 11, and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 4 and 11-13 were withdrawn by the Examiner. New claims 19-25 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hackbarth, H, "Tiffy View Java Edition," Copyright 1998, downloaded from the following website link:

<http://web.archive.org/web/19991106083855/http://www.tiffye/tiffye/Tiffy.html>

(hereinafter Hackbarth), in view of "Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition," Copyright 1997 Microsoft Press (hereinafter Microsoft Press). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants assert that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and

every element of the claimed embodiments of the claimed invention. (*See* M.P.E.P. § 2143). Independent claim 5 is reproduced below:

5. A method for presenting document records to a user through a display interface, comprising the steps of:
- (a) managing a plurality of data files with a host application, the host application supporting applet execution;
 - (b) selecting a data file from a plurality of data files;
 - (c) analyzing the data file for the presence of data of a first type and a second type;
 - (d) *processing data of the first type through a first applet and data of the second type through a second applet;***
 - (e) merging and formatting the processed first and second data within the host application; and
 - (f) displaying the merged and formatted processed first and second data.

Nowhere does Hackbarth teach or suggest processing data of the first type through a first applet and data of the second type through a second applet, as recited in claim 5.

Hackbarth describes a single Java program that can view and print images of the following formats: TIFF, BMP, GIF, JPG (see Hackbarth, page 1, first paragraph).

Hackbarth states that "the program can be run as a Java applet in any Java capable web browser" (see Hackbarth, page 1, third paragraph). Thus, the Office Action appears to assert that Hackbarth teaches multiple data types (TIFF, BMP, GIF, JPG) that can be processed by the applet of Hackbarth. However, this is different from processing data of the first type through a first applet and data of the second type through a second applet. Hackbarth teaches only one applet, not a first applet and a second applet, and for at least this reason, Hackbarth does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 5.

In fact, Hackbarth actually teaches away from the presently claimed embodiments of the present invention. As stated above, and in the Office Action, Hackbarth describes that the Java application can view and print images of several

formats (e.g., "TIFF, BMP, GIF, JPG, PNG," page 1, paragraph 1 of Hackbarth). Thus, there is no need for different applets (i.e., a first applet and a second applet) for processing data of different types when the single applet of Hackbarth can process the different types of data, and therefore Hackbarth actually teaches away from processing data of the first type through a first applet and data of the second type through a second applet, as recited in claim 5. Hackbarth does not suggest the desirability or need for processing using more than one applet, as the Java application of Hackbarth can handle several formats.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Hackbarth does not teach or suggest processing data of the first type through a first applet and data of the second type through a second applet, as recited in claim 5, and in fact, Hackbarth teaches away from this feature of claim 5. Furthermore, Applicants assert that Microsoft Press does not provide the missing teachings. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, claim 5 is patentable over Hackbarth and Microsoft Press, alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 6-10 and 14-18

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6-10 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hackbarth in view of Microsoft Press and further in view of "TIFF, Revision 6.0 Specification," Copyright 06/03/1992, Adobe Developers Association (hereinafter Adobe). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As described above, claim 5 is patentable over Hackbarth and Microsoft Press. Applicants assert that Adobe does not provide the missing teachings with respect to

claim 5. Thus, Applicants assert that claim 5 is patentable over Hackbarth, Microsoft Press, and Adobe, alone or in combination, for at least these reasons. Furthermore, claims 6-10, which depend from independent claim 5, are also patentable over Hackbarth, Microsoft Press, and Adobe, alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 5, and further in view of their own features.

Claim 14 is reproduced as follows:

14. (previously presented) A method of processing a data file having two different data types, comprising the steps of:

- (a) *processing the data file with a first applet, adapted for reading data of a first data type, to extract data of the first data type;*
- (b) *processing the data file with a second applet, adapted for reading data of a second data type, to extract data of the second data type,*

wherein the data file includes an index portion in a header pointing to the first data type, and the second data type resides between the header and the first data type, having an end of file marker at a terminus thereof.

As shown above, claim 14 recites processing the data file with a first applet, adapted for reading data of a first data type, to extract data of the first data type, and processing the data file with a second applet, adapted for reading data of a second data type, to extract data of the second data type. Similarly to the reasons described above for claim 5, Applicants assert that Hackbarth does not teach these features of claim 14, and in fact, Hackbarth teaches away from these features of claim 14. For example, Hackbarth teaches away from processing the data file with a first applet, adapted for reading data of a first data type, and processing the data file with a second applet, adapted for reading data of a second data type. As described above, Hackbarth does not teach or suggest first and second applets. Furthermore, as stated in the Office Action, the applet of Hackbart can view and print images of multiple formats: TIFF, BMP, GIF, JPG, and PNG (called

Tiffy View). Thus, first and second applets adapted for reading data of first and second data types are not needed. For at least these reasons, claim 14 is patentable over Hackbarth.

Furthermore, Applicants assert that Microsoft Press and/or Adobe do not provide the missing teachings. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, claim 14 is patentable over Hackbarth, Microsoft Press, and Adobe, alone or in combination. Furthermore, claims 15-18, which depend from claim 14, are also patentable over Hackbarth, Microsoft Press, and Adobe, alone or in combination, for at least these reasons, and further in view of their own reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6-10 and 14-18 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey S. Weaver", with a large, stylized initial "J" and a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeffrey S. Weaver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,608

Date: October 14, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600